



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,603	11/21/2003	T. Shantha Raju	P1096R1C1	3279
9157	7590	12/21/2007		
GENENTECH, INC. 1 DNA WAY SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080			EXAMINER SCHWADRON, RONALD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,603

Applicant(s)

RAJU, T. SHANTHA

Examiner

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 25, 26, 28, 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

1. Applicant's election without traverse of antibody in the reply filed on 10/15/07 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 7-9,27 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10/15/07.

3. Claims 1-6,25,26,28,29 are under consideration.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-6,25,26,28,29 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9,20,35,37,39,41,43 of copending Application No. 10/744844. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because while the two sets of claims differ in scope, both sets of claims encompass compositions/articles of manufacture that comprise the

glycoproteins/antibodies/immunoadhesins with the properties recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Therefore the two sets of claims would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant has indicated that said issue will be addressed at a later date.

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-6,25,26,28,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no support in the specification as originally filed for the recitation of "G1 or G0 oligosaccharide does not exceed 10% by weight of the preparation". Regarding applicants comments, whilst the cited passage of the specification discloses support for the limitation "G1 and G0 oligosaccharide does not exceed 10% by weight of the preparation", it does not provide support for the scope of the limitation that recites G1 or G0 in the context recited in the claim. There is no written description of the scope of the claimed invention in the specification as originally filed (aka the claimed invention constitutes new matter).

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. The rejection of claims 1-5,25,28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumpel et al. for the reasons elaborated in the previous Office Action is withdrawn in view of the amended claims.

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-6,25,26,28,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumpel et al. in view of Maras et al. (US Patent 5,834,251). Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

Kumpel et al. teach human monoclonal antibodies wherein substantially all of the oligosaccharide found on said antibody is G2 (see Table 1, columns 1-3, and page 149, column 1, first incomplete paragraph). Said antibodies are in composition form wherein they are contained in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (eg. tissue culture media). The antibody 2B6 disclosed in Table 1 is an IgG1 antibody (see page 144, second column). Kumpel et al. teach that antibodies with substantially all G2 oligosaccharide have increased lysis of target cells in comparison to the same antibody which is produced in a manner that results in low levels of G2 (see Figure 3). Kumpel et al. do not teach that the antibodies are of the degree of purity recited in the claims or the articles of manufacture of claim 29. Maras et al. teach that B-1,4 Galactosyltransferase can be used to modify the oligosaccharide profile on a glycoprotein (see columns 12 and 16). Kumpel et al. teach that said enzyme is involved in the production of G2 oligosaccharides (see abstract). A routineer would have used the method of Maras et al. to produce a more highly purified version of the G2 oligosaccharide containing antibody

to further characterize the role of said oligosaccharides in effector function and to produce an antibody with even greater effector function. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have created the claimed invention because Kumpel et al. teach that antibodies with substantially all G2 oligosaccharide have increased lysis of target cells in comparison to the same antibody which is produced in a manner that results in low levels of G2 and Maras et al. teach that B-1,4 Galactosyltransferase can be used to modify the oligosaccharide profile on a glycoprotein (eg. to produce highly pure G2 oligosaccharide glycoproteins). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned in order to produce G2 versions of the aforementioned glycoproteins for potential clinical evaluation. Said G2 glycoproteins would have been produced as the claimed articles of manufacture for use in clinical trials.

Regarding applicants comments, Kumpel et al. that teach that antibodies with substantially all G2 oligosaccharide have increased lysis of target cells in comparison to the same antibody which is produced in a manner that results in low levels of G2 (see Figure 3). Kumpel et al., page 149, first column, first complete paragraph states:

This "hyper-galactosylation" could result in either greater accessibility of these sugar residues to interact with ligands on effector cells, or alternatively it could have the opposite effect whereby the exposed oligosaccharide moieties could sterically hinder these intermolecular interactions. Our results with BRAD-3 supported the first of these possibilities. The "hyper-galactosylated" anti-D (LD BRAD-3) promoted greater FcγRI- and FcγRIII-mediated lysis of erythrocytes in ADCC assays than the anti-D with a lower galactose content (HD BRAD-3) (as shown in *Figures 3 and 4*). LD BRAD-5 was also much more active than HD BRAD-5 in FcγRIII-mediated lysis (*Figure4*), though not with FcγRI-mediated interactions (*Figures 2 and 3*).

12. No claim is allowed.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Serial No. 10/719603


6

Art Unit 1644

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1644


RONALD D. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1644-1644